THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

23 July 1992

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, 20001

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes:

18 June 1992

B. Dates of next meetings:

17 September 1992
29 October 1992
3 December 1992

C. Confirmation of 1993 calendar of meeting dates.

D. Reappointment of Elliott Carroll to Old Georgetown Board.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Park Service, National Capital Region

1. CFA 23/Jul/92-1, Women in Military Service for America Memorial, Memorial Drive Hemicycle, at entrance to Arlington Cemetery. Concept design. (Previous: CFA 28/July/88-3.)

2. CFA 23/Jul/92-2, Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, West Potomac Park. Changes to inscriptions. (Previous: CFA 21/May/92-2.)

3. CFA 23/Jul/92-3, East Potomac Park Golf Course, Ohio Drive, S.W. Design development. (Previous: CFA 16/Apr/92-6.)

4. CFA 23/Jul/92-4, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, New Hampshire Avenue at Rock Creek Parkway. Formal stair from terrace to river's edge. Concept design.

A. National Park Service, National Capital Region

5. CFA 23/Jul/92-5, Vietnam Veterans Memorial, Constitution Avenue at Henry Bacon Drive, N.W. Alteration to walkway.

B. Department of Agriculture

CFA 23/Jul/92-6, National Arboretum, New York Avenue at Bladensburg Road, N.E. Bonsai Pavilion addition. Preliminary design.

C. General Services Administration

CFA 23/Jul/92-7, Federal Bureau of Investigation's Washington Metropolitan Field Office, Square 530, between 3rd, 4th, F & G Streets, N.W. Preliminary design for new building.

D. Department of the Air Force

CFA 23/Jul/92-8, Bolling Air Force Base, NCO Club food service annex. Preliminary design.

E. Smithsonian Institution

CFA 23/Jul/92-9, Lighting. Mall museum buildings: National Air and Space Museum, National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution Building, Arts and Industries Building.

F. Union Station Redevelopment Corporation

CFA 23/Jul/92-10, Alterations to west end of concourse. (Previous: CFA 21/May/92-5.)

G. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 23/Jul/92-11, Relocation of FDR Memorial Plaque on grounds of National Archives Building.

H. Department of the Navy, Chesapeake Division

CFA 23/Jul/92-12, Building 19, Naval Observatory. Renovation and addition. Preliminary design.

I. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

Appendix I.

2. Old Georgetown Act

Appendix II.

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 92-80	2525 Waterside Drive, N.W. John Glavin Residence	Dormers and skylights - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed shed dormers.

S.L. 92-81	510 21st Street, N.W. Potomac Park Ltd. Part. Potomac Park Apartments	Retaining walls and alterations - permit

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST issuance of permit for proposed alterations including replacement of existing stone retaining walls with brick. Recommend study of retaining wall extensions in stone similar to existing. Recommend AGAINST installation of flagpoles in the proposed location.

S.L. 92-82	1620 S. Portal Drive, N.W. Wendell Gaillard Residence	Addition of enclosed porch - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed rear addition of enclosed porch.

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 92-84 HPA. 92-344	3406 P Street, N.W. Hubert K. O'Bannon Residence	Addition and deck at 3rd floor - revised concept

ACTION: No objection to concept for proposed addition and deck at third floor as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 9 July 1992.

O.G. 92-87 HPA. 92-350	3203 Cherry Hill Lane, N.W. C. Gray Residence	Window replacement - revised design

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement in kind of windows using true divided lights as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated __ July 1992.

O.G. 92-89 HPA. 92-357	1339 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. American Security Bank	Handicapped access ramp - permit

ACTION: No objection to concept for a handicapped access ramp. Request submission of details and material selection prior to issuance of permit.

O.G. 92-92 HPA. 92-384	1301 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. John Gantz Stoupsy's	Alterations - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations and new doors as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 6 July 1992 which conform with previously approved concept submission. See previous Action (O.G. 92-57). Request separate submission for signs and sidewalk cafe.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 92-95 HPA. 92-387	1305 30th Street, N.W. rear The Colonial	Raze garage - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed razing of garage structure.

O.G. 92-96 HPA. 92-386	1305 30th Street, N.W. rear The Colonial	Retaining wall- permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed retaining wall provided that top of wall is kept at same level and a wood fence is installed to match existing rather than metal railing proposed.

O.G. 92-97 HPA. 92-392	1054 31st Street, N.W. Canal Square Associates Galleries	Banners - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed 2' x 6' banner as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 9 July 1992.

O.G. 92-98 HPA. 92-394	1516 29th Street, N.W. Jim Rabenhorst Residence	Relocate door, alterations - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of alterations, new stoop and relocation of door to front of house. Request additional study of a door surround similar to neighboring sister house built at same time.

O.G. 92-99 HPA. 92-395	1354 27th Street, N.W. Joanne Salop Residence	Skylights - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed skylights, two on each roof slope, similar to existing conditions on neighboring rowhouse.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 92-100 HPA. 92-396	3700 O Street, N.W. Georgetown University Copley Hall	Addition of fire egress stair - permit

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST issuance of permit for addition of fire stair tower as proposed. Recommend further study of the relationship of the tower for more sympathetic response to the existing historic building.

O.G. 92-102 HPA. 92-399	1101 30th Street, N.W. CP Private Part. Georgetown Inc Georgetown South	Alterations to vestibule - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to vestibule and entrance door.

O.G. 92-103 HPA. 92-405	2611 Dumbarton Street, N.W. John Richardson Residence	Alterations, remove greenhouse - permit

ACTION: No objection to concept of alterations to existing wood frame structure, including removal of greenhouse. Recommend further study of details for proposed work which should be consistent with wood frame structures of this character. Submit additional information prior to issuance of permit.

O.G. 92-104 HPA. 92-406	3116 M Street, N.W. Manhattan Bar & Grille	Alterations to storefront - conceptual

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST concept of proposed alterations which would entail removal of existing storefront. Recommend maintaining existing configuration which contributes to the historic district. Recommend repair as appropriate and replacement in kind as needed.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 92-105 HPA. 92-407	1608 32nd Street, N.W. Brian D. Weaver Residence	Brick arches and iron gates - permit

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST issuance of permit for brick arches and iron gates as proposed. Recommend resubmission for review of iron gates.

O.G. 92-106 HPA. 92-411	1521 28th Street, N.W. Charles & Carol Egbert Residence	Basement entrance - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed basement entrance and steps.

O.G. 92-107 HPA. 92-412	3217 P Street, N.W. 3213 P St. Ltd. Part. Neam's of Georgetown	Side addition - permit

ACTION: Returned without Action at the request of the Permit Branch.

O.G. 92-108 HPA. 92-413	2729 Dumbarton Street, N.W. Mr. & Mrs. Edson Brolin Residence	New window openings - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new window openings.

O.G. 92-110 HPA. 92-415	3423 Q Street, N.W. Lillian Bottalico Residence	Addition of second floor porch, front alterations, revision to permit B372519

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed addition of second floor porch. Proposed new front door surround is not approved. See red-lined drawings.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 92-111 HPA. 92-418	1524 35th Street, N.W. Georgetown Visitation	Porch enclosure - permit

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST issuance of permit for proposed porch enclosure which adversely impacts on historic building.

O.G. 92-113 HPA. 92-430	3000 M Street, N.W. Marbury Inc. Marbury Georgetown Hotel	Satellite antenna on roof - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed satellite antenna dish which will be positioned to be minimally visible from public space. Working drawings conform to previously approved concept submission. See previous action (O.G. 92-47).

O.G. 92-116 HPA. 92-433	2833 M Street, N.W. Embassy of Mongolia	Replacement windows and iron fences - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for replacement windows on first floor for security requirements, for iron gates and railings, and for privacy fence as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 8 July 1992.

O.G. 92-115 HPA. 92-432	3030 Dent Place, N.W. Carlos Gabel Residence	Replacement windows in kind - permit

ACTION: Returned without Action. Proposed work is to be replacement in kind. Proposed change to door surround will be submitted under separate cover.

ADDENDUM

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 92-84 HPA. 92-344	3406 P Street, N.W. Hubert K. O'Bannon Residence	Addition and deck at 3rd floor-revised concept

ACTION: No objection to concept for proposed addition and deck at third floor as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 9 July 1992. Recommend use of a deeper beam as shown in red lined drawings.

O.G. 92-87 HPA. 92-350	3203 Cherry Hill Lane, N.W. C. Gray Residence	Window replacement - revised design

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement in kind of windows using true divided lights. See attached letter from applicant.

O.G. 92-98 HPA. 92-394	1516 29th Street, N.W. Jim Rabenhorst Residence	Relocate door, alterations - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of alterations, new stoop, relocation of door to front of house, and new door surround as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 22 July 1992.

O.G. 92-89 HPA. 92-357	1339 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. American Security Bank	Handicapped access ramp - permit

ACTION: Placed on HOLD for OGB Agenda 3 September 1992 per request of applicant.

ADDENDUM

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 92-103 HPA. 92-405	2611 Dumbarton Street, N.W. John Richardson Residence	Alterations, remove greenhouse - permit

ACTION: Placed on HOLD for OGB Agenda 3 September 1992 per request of applicant.

O.G. 92-107 HPA. 92-412	3217 P Street, N.W. 3213 P St. Ltd. Part.	Side addition - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed side addition as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 3 August 1992, which conform to Board's recommendations. Request separate submission for review of all signs and future alteration to the P Street elevation as a result of the construction of new entrance addition.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts

23 July 1992

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at the Pension Building, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., after a tour of project sites.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Neil H. Porterfield, Vice-Chairman Hon. Adele Chatfield-Taylor Hon. Jeannine Smith Clark Hon. George E. Hartman Hon. Robert A. Peck
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue Kohler Mr. Jose Martinez-Canino
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	Mr. Patrick Tribe

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of the minutes of the 18 June 1992 meeting. The minutes were approved without objection.

B. Dates of next meetings. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor said she would not be able to attend the 17 September meeting and asked if it could be moved from the 17th to the 24th. The Secretary said he would poll the members after they have had a chance to check their calendars. The meetings for the remainder of the year were approved as:

29 October 1992
3 December 1992

C. Confirmation of 1993 calendar of meeting dates. The calendar was confirmed with the exception of the 18 March meeting, which presented a conflict for the Chairman. A date for that meeting will be discussed later.

D. Reappointment of Elliott Carroll to the Old Georgetown Board. The reappointment was unanimously confirmed.

Before the next part of the meeting began, Ms. Westy McDermid, a Georgetown citizen, asked if the Commission would confirm that an application on the Georgetown appendix, O.G. 92-107, was going to be returned to the District without action. Assistant Secretary Myer said it had already been done. (See further discussion at end of meeting, Old Georgetown Appendix.)

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Park Service, National Capital Region

(The agenda order was changed and No. II.A.2 discussed first, followed by II.A.1 and the rest of the agenda, as printed.)

2. CFA 23/JUL/92-2, Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, West Potomac Park. Changes to inscriptions. (Previous: CFA 21/MAY/92-2). Staff member Sue Kohler recalled that when the Commission had first seen the inscriptions, there had been some concern that there were too many of them, and several were too long. It was thought that visitors who were occupied with viewing sculptures and fountains would not take the time to read a great amount of text on the walls. She said there had been several changes made since the May meeting; three inscriptions had been deleted, five shortened, and six moved; those moved were to different locations within a room, so they would not be out of place chronologically. She noted that each member had received a booklet documenting these changes, and then asked for comments.

The Chairman said he had studied the booklet, sent by landscape architect Lawrence Halprin, and had several suggestions. In the first room, he thought inscription 1-3, which had to do with unemployment, could be shortened by deleting the first sentence. Then he questioned whether 1-8, which talked about social justice, could be shortened or perhaps deleted, since the idea was expressed elsewhere. In the second room, he questioned the necessity of 2-3, an inscription relative to the Tennessee Valley Authority. Ms. Kohler noted that the National Parks inscription had been entirely deleted, and wondered if it would not be more meaningful to the visitor than the establishment of the TVA.

Ms. Chatfield-Taylor said she would be reluctant to omit 1-8, and Mr. Peck suggested trying to shorten the TVA reference, although he admitted it would be difficult. Mr. Hartman said he thought good progress had been made, but he would favor further reductions. Mrs. Kohler said that Mr. Halprin, who was not present, would be happy to talk to the members by telephone, if they had questions.

The Chairman brought up another matter, which had been pointed out to him by the Secretary. This was the placing of the portrait of the President on the Houston, as Commander-in-Chief, after the relief showing his funeral cortege; Mr. Atherton thought this break in chronological sequence might be disturbing to the visitor. Mrs. Kohler said that during a telephone conversation with Mr. Halprin, he had explained it by saying that he did not want to leave the visitor with a funeral, but with the realization that the President's ideas were carried forward after his death, for example, with the founding of the United Nations. The final vigorous portrait would then function as a kind of apotheosis. Mr. Atherton said he was not bothered by that idea, but thought that the final portrait should then be a general one, not one representing a specific point in time. However, he said he thought the average person would not realize that there was a specific event being portrayed, especially since there was no title, and the solution was acceptable, if not ideal. It was also pointed out that there were quotations from the President that came after the funeral cortege, so the portrait would not really seem out of place.

There was no further discussion, and Mrs. Kohler said the Commission's comments would be given to the Park Service. Exhibit A

1. CFA 23/JUL/92-1, Women in Military Service for America Memorial, Memorial Drive Hemicycle, at entrance to Arlington Cemetery. Concept design. (Previous: CFA 28/JUL/88-3.) Mrs. Kohler said this was the first time the Commission had seen a design for this memorial, although the site had been approved in 1988. She said the members had thought the site appropriate, but cautioned that the design would have to be a very subtle one that would not detract from the architecture of the hemicycle or the area in front of it. She noted that these elements had been designed by William Mitchell (Kendall) of McKim, Mead & White as part of the Memorial Bridge project in the early 1930s. She added that the restoration and completion of the hemicycle by the sponsoring organization was a requirement for the use of the site.

Mrs. Kohler said there had been an open, two-stage competition for the design in 1989. Four finalists were chosen in the first stage, and after further examination of each design, the entry of Marion Gail Weiss and Michael

Manfredi was selected for development. The winning design underwent some changes after review by the National Capital Memorial Commission, notably the elimination of ten glass pylons along the top of the hemicycle wall, and was then approved by that commission in May 1992. Mrs. Kohler noted the presence at the meeting of Brigadier General Wilma Vaught, USAF (Ret.), president of the Women in Military Service for America, the architects, project manager John Carr,and John Parsons from the National Park Service; she asked Mr. Parsons to begin the presentation.

Mr. Parsons said the Park Service had been working with the sponsoring group and the Memorial Commission on the design for several years, and noted that it had just been approved by the Planning Commission. He said he was pleased to be presenting it to the Commission of Fine Arts, and then introduced General Wilma Vaught. General Vaught talked about the purpose of the memorial, stressing that it would honor all women who had served, in all wars. She then asked the architects to discuss their design.

Using slides, Michael Manfredi gave a brief history of the site, beginning with Jefferson's early plan for the city and its link with the river, followed by the McMillan Commission's development of L'Enfant's Mall axis to the west, with the placing of the Lincoln Memorial and the bridge link to Arlington Cemetery. He noted the modifications since that time: the construction of Memorial Drive and the hemicycle, and the recent construction of the Visitors Center. He said the site had important limitations but also offered great opportunities. He showed his proposal: the court in front of the hemicycle was paved in a series of broad terraced steps with a round pool in the center, creating a place for ceremonies. Bosques of trees framed the court as it faced Memorial Drive. At the hemicycle wall, stairs were inserted into four of the niches, two on either side of the central niche; these gave access to the upper terrace, for views of Arlington Cemetery and across to the memorials of the Mall, as well as views into the Memorial Center within the hemicycle. The main entrance to the Memorial Center would be at the south end of the hemicycle. The interior spaces--a memorial gallery documenting the history of women in the military, a special exhibitions space, theatre, computer registration room, Hall of Honor, and office/meeting rooms--would be lit by skylights breaking through at the upper terrace level.

Mr. Manfredi's partner, Marian Weiss, talked about the symbolic aspects of the design. She said this was to be a living memorial, embracing the ideal of life, light, water and passage; it was about the celebration of individual women coming together with the collective purpose of serving their

country. Their voices would be represented by the water that began at the base of the glass skylights of the upper terrace, cascaded down the inner face of the central niche, and ran in a channel to the central pool in the court of honor. The stairs in the niches represented the barriers that had been broken by women. She described the sections of the skylights as glass "pages", some with a text relative to the accomplishments and thoughts of military women in the past; others blank, waiting to be written on. She noted that light coming through the glass would enable the inscriptions to be read on the gallery walls.

In answer to questions from the members, Ms. Weiss said the berms at the rear of the hemicycle, made necessary by the construction, would align with the top of the wall and would not be visible above it. Visitors standing on the terrace would be able to see over them into the cemetery, but there would be no access to the cemetery itself. Handicapped entrance to the upper terrace would be through elevators in the existing pylons. Mr. Manfredi said that restoration of the hemicycle would be undertaken in association with restoration architect Mary Oehrlein. General Vaught said she would like to point out that some of the trees in front of the court, as shown on the drawings and the model, would be removed so that the vista along Memorial Drive would not be narrowed.

The Chairman said he was pleased with the design, and was especially taken with the idea of being able to read the skylight inscriptions on the walls below. He cautioned, however, that the visibility of these glass areas would have to be studied from various vantage points, and any night lighting very carefully considered in view of the importance of the site in relation to other memorials.

The other point of concern was the placing of stairs in the niches. Mr. Porterfield was concerned that they were too steep, and Mr. Hartman thought they would look better if they were set back a little further from the wall. Mr. Manfredi said he understood the criticism and would continue to work on the stair design, although space was tight and he was not sure how much adjustment he could make. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor thought some refinement was also needed in the stairs as they emerged from the berm in back. She complemented the architects on their design, saying it was a preservation as well as an architectural achievement, and would result in an enhancement of the area. Mr. Peck said he would like to comment on a small but important design matter: he hoped the architects would resist any pressure to put a railing around the pool and water channel.

There was no further discussion, and the concept design was unanimously approved. Exhibit B

3. CFA 23/JUL/92-3, East Potomac Park Golf Cource, Ohio Drive, S.W. Design development. (Previous: CFA 16/APR/92-6.) Staff member Jeffrey Carson introduced Jeff Knoedler from the Park Service to begin the presentation. Mr. Knoedler told the members that the parking lot reconfiguration and enlargement, about which they had been concerned during the first submission, had been postponed until the second phase of development. He then introduced architect Mary Oehrlein to discuss the first phase.

Ms. Oehrlein said this phase would include the pro shop, the driving range, and the landscaping in the area. She showed drawings, pointing out that there had been minor modifications to the landscaping and walkways and to the driving range structure, the latter in the interest of safety, in consideration of the number of golfers swinging clubs within a very small area. She said the color would be light buff with dark green trim.

Mr. Peck asked what had happened in regard to the unsightly property near the old clubhouse, owned by the District government; Mr. Knoedler said discussion had started concerning their needs in that area. There were no further questions, no objections to the changes that had been made, and they were unanimously approved. Exhibit C

4. CFA 23/JUL/92-4, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, New Hampshire Avenue at Rock Creek Parkway. Formal stair from terrace to river's edge. Concept design. (Before the discussion began, the Chairman reminded the other members that under federal statute he was, as Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, an ex officio member of the Kennedy Center board. They agreed there was no need for him to recuse himself.) Mr. Carson then introduced John Parsons, from the Park Service, who said the idea for the stair had come from architect Arthur Cotton Moore, and that it would be privately funded. He then introduced Charles Meng, director of administration of the Kennedy Center. Mr. Meng noted first that Edward Durrell Stone's original design for the building had had a stair down to the river. After some questioning, it was generally agreed that it was not the design for the existing building that had a stair, but an earlier design, which had a large curved section coming out to the river. Mr. Meng said the president of the Center had endorsed the stair concept, as had the Federal City Council, which had also offered financial support. Additional endorsements had come from the NCPC, the Business and Professional Association of Georgetown, and the Foggy Bottom ANC; each organization had raised issues it would like to see addressed in the final

design, and Mr. Meng said they were being taken into consideration. Mr. Meng said Turner Construction Company had offered to do the estimating, so that the Center would have some idea of the cost.

Mr. Moore then discussed his proposal. He observed that the Kennedy Center had always had an intensely automotive entrance, and that the cantilevered terrace always looked as though it wanted to bridge the parkway and go over to the river, providing an entrance for pedestrians walking along the river or those who might like to arrive by boat. He showed a drawing of his proposal, a single monumental stair cantilevered from the terrace and flanked by two square pylons, one of which would contain an elevator for the handicapped. Mr. Moore thought his proposal would humanize the building and give people a chance to sit on the stairs and look at the river; there would also be a promenade from the foot of Wisconsin Avenue in Georgetown to the Kennedy Center, parallel to the bike path. In the event a ferry service was begun, as had been suggested, the ferry could dock in front of the stair.

In general, the Commission thought the idea had merit, but there was a feeling that a single run of steps was rather forbidding. There was some question whether there was enough space between the terrace and the river to allow for a landing and for a better tread/riser relationship, so that the stair would be less steep. When asked if he could start the stair within the terrace, Mr. Moore said he did not want to interfere with the orginal building if he could help it. Mr. Parsons said a concern of the Park Service was that the stair might make a tunnel of the parkway and interfere with views of the river.

Realizing that the design was in a very preliminary stage and funding was uncertain, the Chairman told Mr. Parsons that the Commission thought the concept was a good one and should be pursued, with the recommendations made, but could make no further comment at this time. Exhibit D

5. CFA 23/JUL/92-5, Vietnam Veterans Memorial, Constitution Avenue and Henry Bacon Drive, N.W. Alterations to walkway. The Assistant Secretary introduced Carla Corbin, landscape architect for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, after noting that the members had been to the site on their pre-meeting tour. Ms. Corbin said the tenth anniversary of the dedication of the memorial would be celebrated on Veterans Day, and there was a considerable amount of maintenance that needed to be done before that time. She said the Fund had a budget of about $200,000, and the biggest item, which they had just decided to go ahead with, would be placing the granite setts in mortar, to stabilize them and eliminate the

unevenness. Ms. Corbin said work had to be done on the ends of the wall, and the lights along the path needed redoing. She added that they would like to lower the tree lights that illuminate the flag and statue so that they could be reached with a normal ladder.

Vice-Chairman Porterfield said that after visiting the site, he realized major work needed to be done, and it require careful study before proceeding; he thought only the things that needed immediate attention should be undertaken before the anniversary celebration. The Chairman agreed, saying that there was not enough time, nor money, to do the work properly. He thought it would be best just to add a second row of setts, correct the unevenness as necessary for safety, and repair the lighting. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor thought Maya Lin should be brought in on the long-range work to try to bring back a sense of simplicity to the memorial. She and Vice-Chairman Porterfield both commented that it was important to bring back the feeling of green coming up to the wall; the other members agreed. She said there were ways to underpin the grass so that it could withstand the foot traffic, and she thought this should be looked into thoroughly. She also thought the landscaping around the statue needed to be reworked and the circulation improved. Mr. Parsons commented that it was true that the statue did not have a sense of place, although that was what the present setting was supposed to provide. He said that as he saw it, two studies should be undertaken: how to bring at least varying shades of green right up to the wall, and how to treat the statue area so that problems of circulation and proper setting would be solved. The members unanimously agreed that that summarized their recommendations.

Exhibit E

B. Department of Agriculture

CFA 23/JUL/92-6, National Arboretum, New York Avenue at Bladensburg, N.E. Bonsai Pavilion addition. Preliminary design. Mr. Carson said this greenhouse addition had been a gift from the National Bonsai Association, and introduced H. William Merritt from the association to describe it.

Mr. Merritt first reviewed the chronology of the Arboretum's Bonsai collection, noting the original gift of fifty-three Bonsai in 1976, thirty-one Penjing in 1986, and a third gift of fifty North American Bonsai and a pavilion to house them in, in 1990. He said the new greenhouse addition would provide winter protection for the twenty plants that needed it, and would adjoin the 1990 Naka pavilion. He showed plans and elevation drawings of the addition. The Secretary explained to the members that there had been some confusion as to whether the Arboretum had to submit this project to the Commission, with the result that the working drawings were 95% complete. The members were pleased that the confusion had

been cleared up; there were no objections to the design of the addition, and it was unanimously approved. Exhibit F

C. General Services Administration

CFA 23/JUL/92-7, Federal Bureau ofInvestigation's Washington Metropolitan Field Office, Square 530, between 3rd, 4th, F & G streets, N.W. Preliminary design. The Assistant Secretary said the Commission had encouraged early review of this major project on Judiciary Square, so they would know how it would fit into the master plan; he noted that the members had seen the site on their pre-meeting tour. He introduced architect David Childs from Skidmore, Owings & Merrill to discuss the preliminary massing studies with drawings and a model.

Mr. Childs talked about the importance of Judiciary Square in the plan of Washington, pointing out on drawings the axis between the Old City Hall and the Pension Building, and the location of the new Law Enforcement Officers Memorial between the two landmark buildings. He noted the FBI's site east of the Pension Building, and the precast concrete buildings to the south along 4th and 5th streets, all built in conformance with the 1970s master plan. This plan mandated 90-foot buildings surrounding the Square; after a setback, the height could go up to 120 feet. Mr. Childs pointed out also the large, limestone GAO building, north of the Pension Building, built in 1950; the smaller light stone court buildings from the 1930s flanking the square; and the more domestic-scale remnants of the Victorian period.

Mr. Childs then discussed several massing alternatives that had been developed for the site, using small building models that fit into the large site model. The first had a centered, projecting pavilion up to the 90-foot level; the second also used a projecting pavilion, but it would line up with the Pension Building, making an asymmetrical building facade; the third repeated the asymmetrical pavilion, but continued it to the southwest corner, stressing its horizontality by setting the facade back under projecting roofs; the northwest corner element was treated separately, perhaps as a tower. All the schemes had flat roofs with penthouses, but a vaulted roof was shown as an alternative. Mr. Childs said he thought the style should be more modern than historic, but he would like to depart from the precast and tinted glass vocabulary of the 1970s buildings, and use clear glass and limestone. He thought appropriateness to the context should be the determining factor in both style and materials.

The Chairman said he agreed with Mr. Childs' premises and liked the idea of moving the center of gravity to the Pension

Building cross-axis. He thought the building should be kept within the modernist vocabulary, though he agreed it did not need to use the materials of the 1970s buildings; he did not like the vaulted roof alternative. The other members seconded the Chairman's comments, with Mr. Hartman observing that the WMATA building on the west side of the Pension Building was the best of the modernist buildings in the area, and Mr. Childs now had a chance to put an equally good building on the east side. He said the massing studies had been helpful, and the next step was to go on to the elevations, which he thought were going to be especially important in this building. Commenting on the version with a horizontally-divided pavilion, he said he would prefer it without a tower on the northwest corner.

There was no further discussion. The Chairman said there were no approvals involved at this early stage, but he thanked Mr. Childs for bringing in the massing studies and briefing the Commission on his thinking. Exhibit # G

(Mrs. Clark entered the meeting at this point.)

D. Department of the Air Force

CFA 23/JUL/92-8, Bolling Air Force Base, NCO Club food service annex. Preliminary design. Staff member Jose Martinez pointed out the location on an aerial photograph: just south of the marina, on the Potomac River. He introduced Robert McCann from the Air Force and Robert Corcoran from Kvell/Corcoran, architects, to make the presentation.

Mr. McCann said this facility would be part of a multi-million dollar expansion and restoration project at Bolling Air Force Base. The food annex, on a 3 1/4 acre piece of land, would contain about 4,000 square feet, plus a deck for outdoor dining; the 45-foot-high structure would be situated on the river, about 7 feet above grade. It was described as being based on turn-of-the-century boathouse design; the most notable element was a series of peaked roofs on the river facade, emphasized by exposed steel trusses. Mr. McCann said the building would be enclosed with cedar siding, the roof would be metal, and the decks wood. The entrance would be from the parking lot at the rear (east), with the service entrance to the south. He said the building had been oriented to take advantage of the views. Turning to the landscaping, he said it would conform to the master plan, with white pines planted along the street, maples in the parking lot, and ornamental trees at several points around the building.

The Chairman said he liked traditional boathouse design, but thought this one looked more like a ski lodge, with its very steep roofs. He found them too exaggerated, especially

the metal framing coming out in front. The other members agreed, and Vice-Chairman Porterfield said he was also concerned that the building was sited too close to the river; it needed to be set back and respect the river and its setting. Mr. McCann said many people would come by boat, from the marina and points farther away, and they needed to be able to dock their boats underneath the facility. Mr. Porterfield was afraid that when approaching by boat, the building would look like a series of A-frames.

Mr. Peck asked the architect what his precedent was for this boathouse design. Mr. Corcoran said he had looked at local examples and those in the Thousand Islands. Mr. Hartman thought the scale was too large, and he noticed that the perspective drawing made the roofs look much steeper and more dominant than did the elevation drawings. Mr. Corcoran said the elevation drawings were correct. Mr. Hartman suggested making the triangular sections less steep and more like dormers; anything that would bring down the scale would help. He also commented that the river and the harbor were skewed, and the building should follow that line; the decks, too, should respond and not be symmetrical. The Chairman noted that Victorian design was rooted in asymmetry; a realization of this design principle would help make a more relaxed, less obtrusive design. Mr. Peck added that something should be done to make the east facade, facing the parking lot, more interesting, since that was where most people would enter.

The preliminary design was not approved, and Mr. Corcoran said they would go back and take another look at the elevations and the siting. The Chairman suggested that instead of expensive perspective drawings, a simple model be brought in so that the Commission could experience the design in three dimensions. Exhibit G & H

E. Smithsonian Institution

CFA 23/JUL/92-9, Lighting. Mall museum buildings: National Air and Space Museum, National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution Building, Arts and Industries Building. Mr. Carson said this project included several kinds of lighting--building lighting, ground lighting, and standard lighting. He said that for the most part the source would be metal halide; the exception would be the Smithsonian Castle and the Arts and Industries building. Because the metal halide makes red brick look black, these buildings would be lit with incandescent. Mr. Carson introduced Harry Rombach, Chief of the Smithsonian's Planning, Programming and Budget Department, to show drawings and explain the lighting plan for each building.

Mr. Rombach said the purpose of the program was to provide a secure nighttime environment for museum staff and visitors on the Mall. He said there were a number of dark and insecure places created by both buildings and landscaping, and this was a matter of increasing concern because of the growing popularity of nighttime events at the Smithsonian museums. He said attempts to correct this had begun in 1981, and he recalled submissions to the Commission for security lighting at the Freer Gallery, Natural History Museum, and in connection with the renovation of the plaza at the Hirshhorn. Before discussing plans for four additional buildings, Mr. Rombach said these plans had been developed in cooperation with two interagency groups: the Interagency Task Force on Mall Lighting, which had recommended the use of metal halide on the Mall, with the exception of a strip of incandescent down the center; and the more recent Task Force on Mall Roads, which supported the use of metal halide and made specific recommendations in its Streetscape Manual.

Mr. Rombach recalled the mock-ups that had been reviewed in March by representatives of the various agencies involved, including the Commission of Fine Arts. He said they had realized that security lighting had to include building lighting, that reflective light was important in lighting dark areas. He noted also that the original designs for both the American History and Air and Space museums included building lighting, so it was appropriate to follow the architect's intent. The result of the mock-up was the recommendation that the lighting in general be made dimmer and paler, that incandescent be used on the red brick buildings, and an effort made to warm the metal halide (for some uses) by using a combination lighting type. Mr. Rombach discussed the attempt to combine sodium vapor and metal halide, saying that it had only limited success because the double color was quite evident at the source; metal halide with a pink filter was seen as a better way to achieve a warmer effect. He then discussed the lighting generally, noting the intensity on the walks, the use of white metal halide on horizontal surfaces, and a warmer light (metal halide with a pink filter) for vertical surfaces. Incandescent would be used for incidental lighting, and for lighting sculpture.

Mr. Rombach then went into detail on the proposals for the Air and Space Museum, noting first that a major effort would be made to get the sodium vapor street lighting off Independence Avenue. He showed the plans for the other buildings more briefly, saying that the same general principles would be followed, except that the Castle and Air and Space would be lit with incandescent. Mr. Peck asked a question about the various types of fixtures to be used. Mr. Rombach said the Park Service was using the Olmsted fixture on the Mall, with the standard Washington Globe used on the

cross streets. Mr. Carson pointed out that some of the special fixtures mentioned by Mr. Rombach were used only in connection with a specific building; the Castle, for example, had Victorian fixtures on its grounds. Mr. Hartman asked for the name of the lighting consultant and was told it was Posey Associates.

There were no further questions for Mr. Rombach, and the lighting plans were approved with the recommendation that allowance be made for flexibility and level adjustment at each installation. Exhibit # 1

F. Union Station Redevelopment Corporation

CFA 23/JUL//92-10, Alterations to west end of concourse. (Previous: CFA 21/MAY/92-5) Mr. Martinez noted that the members had been to the station before the meeting and looked at both the exterior and interior conditions at the west end of the concourse. David Ball from the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation and Cubie Dawson from Union Station Ventures reviewed the previous plans for the area, thanked the Commission for its comments and interest, and turned the presentation over to Tom Green from Benjamin Thompson Associates. Mr. Green said his firm strongly supported the transparent version of the west end concourse addition, feeling that it would enhance, rather than hide, the view of the old City Post Office from the interior, and would have the least negative impact on the existing concourse facade and the station itself; he said the streetscape would also be improved. On the interior, the addition would complete what appeared to be the unfinished end of a great building, and the transparent retail space would respond to the form of the concourse. Mr. Green then asked architect John Shank to discuss the details.

Beginning with the exterior, Mr. Shank said the glass would be clear, not tinted, and would have some kind of texture in the roof section. He showed drawings, noting that the addition had been pulled back farther from the parking ramp, leaving room for planting between it and the curb, to soften the edge. He thought this and an extension of the curb line would make the ramp look more like an extension of First Street. He pointed out that the "ad hoc" loading dock area in front of the carriage porch had been eliminated and replaced with paving, benches and potted plants. Turning to renderings of the interior, Mr. Shank said the storefront and its canopy had been pulled back, so it would not impinge on the crowded escalator area, and the canopy was now symmetrical between the two piers. The storefront itself had an "S" curve, to alter and improve the circulation around the Metro escalators.

The Chairman commended Mr. Shank and the others on their response to the Commission's previous comments. He said that during the site inspection, the members had expressed their satisfaction with the plans for a transparent addition to the exterior, because of the way it would complement the building and help mask the parking garage. Commenting on the interior, Mr. Hartman said he thought the extension was still excessive and should be held back to the piers of the main structure; otherwise, the space would be uncomfortable, especially when coming up the escalators. The Chairman said he thought all the members had the same feeling; they also thought that the "S" curve, while beautiful in itself, was found nowhere else in the building and would look too fussy. The members and the architects then went over to a large model and discussed ways that an adequate retail space might be brought into the area; the conclusion was that it had to be held back to the line of the structure of the building. The applicants said they would restudy this aspect of the addition. Exhibit J

G. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 23/JUL/92-11, Relocation of FDR Memorial Plaque on grounds of National Archives Building. The Assistant Secretary introduced Jan Frankina, from PADC, to describe this project. She showed photographs of the granite memorial and said the request was simply to make the information about it more easily accessible to the public. As existing, the information was on a granite plaque placed flat on the ground and therefore difficult to read. The solution suggested was to take the existing plaque and place it on a granite base, in a tilted position, so that it could be easily read, even by those in wheelchairs. The information would be repeated in braille. The base would be set in the curb at the edge of the sidewalk. There were no objections, and the project was unanimously approved. Exhibit K

H. Department of the Navy, Chesapeake Division

CFA 23/JUL/92-12, Building 19, Naval Observatory. Renovation and addition. Preliminary design. Mr. Myer said this submission involved the renovation and enlargement of an existing stable-like structure for use by the Secret Service detailed to the Vice-President. He noted that it was near the residence and pointed out its location on a map, observing that it was an "L"-shaped building which would have a "T"-shaped addition, making it a "U" shape. Larry Earle from the Navy was then introduced to discuss the proposal.

Mr. Earle said the building was about 500 feet from the Massachusetts Avenue entrance and about 200 feet from the residence; a drop in grade placed it 11 feet below the house. He said it was used 24 hours a day by three shifts of

officers, and the space was far from adequate. He said various obstacles had limited the direction in which they could expand; they had finally come up with a "T"-shaped configuration which would fit into the existing building and work well, although it created some minor problems on the exterior: an asymmetrical entrance and a change in window spacing in one area. Mr. Earle said they would continue the brick construction, painted white, and the use of segmental window arches; he thought it important to keep the "dependency" character and not make the building stand out or detract from the residence. The major visual change would be the addition of shutters on the principal facade. Mr. Peck asked if the addition had been through the process required by Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act. Mr. Earle said it had not, that the Commission was the first body to see it. The Secretary noted that the question would arise as to how the addition was detailed, because the guidelines specified that new construction had to be clearly differentiated from the historic fabric. He said the staff felt that could be a real problem in this case; given the way the new construction was fitted in, it would have to be very much like the original or it would not be satisfactory aesthetically. In answer to a question from the Chairman, Mr. Earle said the building was constructed in 1893 and a rear addition had been put on in the 1930s; additionally, many of the windows had been changed over the years.

Mr. Peck said he thought it was a nice approach; his only question was whether shutters should be added to a building that did not have any. Mr. Hartman was also pleased with the design, although he, too, questioned the use of shutters. He thought that if they were to be used, they should be on all sides of the building; he thought that in general all facades should be dealt with in the same manner and have the same level of finish.

The architect, Dale Haas, said he was aware of the problems the members had pointed out and would continue to work on them. The Chairman and Mr. Hartman talked to him about ways the design could be refined and new construction differentiated from old by subtle detailing. It was agreed by all that the preliminary design was proceeding in the right direction, and it was approved with the recommendations made.

Exhibit 第 L

I. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

Appendix I. The appendix was approved without objection.

2. Old Georgetown Act

Appendix II. Architect William Cochran asked to comment on O.G. 92-107, 3217 P Street, N.W., Neam's Market (3213 P Street Ltd. Partnership). During the discussion of the Administration part of the agenda, Mrs. McDermid had asked if the Commission was going to return this case without action. Mr. Myer said it had already been done. The problem, according to Mr. Cochran, was an incorrect date inadvertently written on the application by a zoning official, and two small calculating errors in the number of square feet, found by the zoning official after Mrs. McDermid and Mrs. Alicia Boyd asked him to take another look at the application. (It was at this time that the staff returned the application to zoning.) Since that time the drawings had been corrected and approved (during this meeting) and Mr. Cochran was now requesting that the Commission give them final approval. He said, and the staff confirmed, that the Georgetown Board had approved the design and the "problems" with zoning had nothing to do with it.

The members discussed the question with the staff, and it was decided that as there was going to be a special meeting of the Georgetown Board the following Thursday, the Commission would delegate approval authority to the Board.

There were no further questions regarding the Georgetown appendix, and it was approved without objection.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H.Atherton,
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

29 July 1992

EXHIBIT A

Dear Mr. Stanton:

At its 23 July meeting the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed proposals for deleting, editing, and moving some of the inscriptions at the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial.

The changes were all approved, but the members thought further reductions in number and length should be studied. Several suggestions are marked on the attached sheets.

The staff would be happy to work with the Park Service and Mr. Halprin on this matter.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Robert G. Stanton, Regional Director
National Park Service, National Capital Region
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

cc. Frances Campbell, Executive Director,
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT B

29 July 1992

Dear Mr. Stanton:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed the concept design for the Women in Military Service for America Memorial at its 23 July meeting. The design was unanimously approved, and the members were pleased to hear that one aspect of it will be the restoration and completion of the historic hemicycle and memorial gate area at the entrance to Arlington Cemetery.

The Commission understands that many details remain unresolved. The stairs and their incorporation into the niches of the hemicycle and the berm behind are of particular concern, as is the visibility of the glass skylight,especially at night, from various vantage points.

We look forward to further review as the design is developed.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Robert G. Stanton, Regional Director
National Park Service, National Capital Region
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

cc Brigadier General Wilma L. Vaught, USAF (Ret.),
President, Women in Military Service for America
Memorial Foundation

John C. Metzler, Jr., Superintendent
Arlington National Cemetery

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT C

29 July 1992

Dear Mr. Stanton:

During its meeting of 23 July 1992, the Commission reviewed and approved concept development drawings for the proposed upgrading of the East Potomac Park Golf Course on Ohio Drive, S.W. The members were pleased by the development of the design both with respect to the pro-shop and driving range structures as well as the landscaping. The Commission is most heartened to learn that the Park Service is treating the matter of the parking plan seriously and will be presenting the result of this endeavor, along with final drawings for the golf range, in the near future.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Robert Stanton, Regional Director
National Capital Region
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT D

29 July 1992

Dear Mr. Stanton:

The Commission of Fine Arts was happy to consider at its meeting on 23 July 1992 architect Arthur Cotton Moore's proposal for introducing new steps to the river from the Kennedy Center. As you know Edward Stone's plans called for such a connection but because of excessive cost his original design had to be abandoned.

The Commission believes the concept is worth pursuing. The most serious problem is the very limited space between the edge of the terrace and the river which is further constricted by the parkway. As a result, a single run of monumental steps to grade may prove difficult to handle as presented. Ideally, such a difference in elevation should be accommodated in at least two stages with landings in between and with as generous a ratio of rise to tread as possible. The current design is steep and looks it.

A connection to the river would be a good urban amenity and add to the enjoyment of both the Kennedy Center and the adjoining park, something that regrettably is missing in the present circumstances.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Robert G. Stanton, Regional Director
National Park Service, National Capital Region
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT E

29 July 1992

Dear Mr. Stanton:

The Commission met with representatives of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Foundation at its meeting on 23 July 1992 to consider several changes they wish to fund as part of the 10th anniversary celebrations of the dedication of the memorial. We understand their interest in doing something to improve certain conditions at the site as a way of marking this event, but we feel nothing should be done hastily simply because of the impending schedule.

This is especially true of anything that might materially alter the character of the existing design such as reconstructing the paving of the main walkway. No one disagrees that the granite setts in their current condition leave much to be desired. To replace them all in a new bed of mortar, however, is going to affect significantly the scale of the path and drastically alter its relationship to the walls. Our concerns on this point were clearly confirmed by a careful inspection of the site prior to our deliberations. Although there is a certain unevenness in the surfaces, there is much to be said for the resulting contrast which is reinforced with the tint of green provided by natural growth in the spaces between the granite setts. To replace this with a yet wider swath of uniform masonry should give us all pause.

We are happy to keep an open mind about the matter, but if change is to occur, it should not be done in a piecemeal manner and in no way under the press of an artificially imposed time constraint.

Other issues that were discussed may prove less of a problem. The lighting of the flags and statue can certainly be adjusted by lowering the fixtures in the trees to provide easier accessibility. However, we again caution against any significant design changes such as introducing pole-mounted lighting in the area. The more architectural elements there are, the more one risks diminishing the simplicity of the memorial. To this we must all agree.

As a part of the continuing efforts to upgrade conditions, we urge some thought be given to a different choice of plant material around the base of the statue. The current shrubs obviously suffer from viewers climbing over

the chain to be photographed next to the three soldiers. Perhaps some planting that was less "user friendly" to this practice might be preferable.

We also feel the portion of the circular path that stops abruptly in a clump of shrubbery should be reexamined. It seemed like a good idea at the time to reinforce the "copse of trees" concept with the circular path, but circumstances have not evolved quite that way, and this may be a good time for readjustment.

We look forward to working with your staff and the consulting architect on the development of these ideas.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Robert G. Stanton, Regional Director
National Park Service, National Capital Region
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT # F

29 July 1992

Dear Mr. Reilly:

During its meeting of 23 July 1992, the Commission reviewed and approved plans for the proposed addition to the Bonsai Pavilion at the National Arboretum. The members were pleased to learn first hand from Mr. Merritt of the National Bonsai Foundation about this generous donation and note that working drawings are 95% complete. Fortunately, a delay was not incurred in the construction schedule as a result of the meeting. The members understand that any confusion with respect to the review process has been clarified and that future projects intended for the National Arboretum will be submitted for concept review.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Edward Reilly, Chief
Real Property Management Branch
Agricultural Research Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Greenbelt, Maryland 20770-1433

cc. H. William Merritt

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT # G

29 July 1992

Dear Mr. Sherman:

The Commission appreciated the opportunity to see preliminary studies for the FBI Washington Field Office at 4th and F Street, N.W. at its meeting on 23 July 1992. Its relation to the Pension Office and Judiciary Square involve important urban design questions, and it is reassuring to see plans for a major new building on this site being approached in such a brilliant and thoughtful way.

The central urban-design challenge relates to the degree to which the center of the site does not align with the east elevation of the Pension Office and its powerful symmetry, but falls a good bit to the north. One of the architect's solutions that offers the most promise directly reflects the situation by developing the principal entrance elevation on axis with the Pension Building and filling out the rest of the frontage with a element, with or without a tower, on the northwest corner. This is not the kind of scheme envisioned when the master plan was originally drawn up in the 60's, but it is a very interesting solution and deserves everyone's serious consideration.

There are other features of the old plan that were adopted by the Zoning Commission as design guidelines that also should be reconsidered, such as the use of poured-in-place or pre-cast concrete as the principal exterior material, and darkly tinted glazing for the fenestration. These were favored at a certain point in the development of Judiciary Square, but they do not necessarily fit the situation on this particular site at this particular time. We support the architect's recommendation to re-examine these premises. As a federal building, of course, this will not by law have to adhere to these master plan rules, but as we all know, "rules" that have been around awhile have a way of influencing designs whether currently valid or not.

We look forward to following the continuing development

of this project. At its present stage, it looks very promising indeed.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Thomas M. Sherman
Assistant Regional Administrator
GSA/PBS
Washington, D.C. 20407

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT H

29 July 1992

Dear Colonel Gray:

During its meeting 23 July 1992, the Commission reviewed preliminary designs for the proposed NCO Club annex at Bolling Air Force Base. The Commission regrets that the project is not acceptable in its present form.

Though there is no objection to the general location of the new structure, the members question the character and silhouette of the design and the awkward relationship of the structure to the river edge. As such, the Commission recommends pulling the building back further from its current position. If required parking is jeopardizing the process, the lost space can be regained by eliminating the pavilions and moving the structure closer to the marina.

As to character, the prominent gables, steep roof pitches and whimsical pavilions appear to be more closely associated to a building type suitable for a ski resort. The look is frankly alien to a structure oriented to a river in a hot climate on a military reservation. There are good precedents for other solutions.

The military has a rich heritage of historic building types from which to choose. One that comes to the staff's mind is a 19th century officers quarters often found in the tropics: a wood structure, rectangular in plan, surrounded by a veranda, capped by a hipped roof and raised on piers screened by lattice. This building type could be modified and expanded upon easily in order to suit your needs without incurring exorbitant expense.

As a final note, several members found the land side approach to the club annex unnecessarily bleak. With adjustment to the circulation pattern and service functions, and keeping in mind the above suggestion, an entrance gallery, veranda or glazed porch could be introduced.

The Commission realizes that we have provided you with

a considerable challenge. However, the prominence of the site and the unique relationship of the project to the river warrant additional effort. Be assured, the staff is available should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Colonel Walter L. Gray, USAF
Base Civil Engineer
Department of the Air Force
Headquarters 1100th Air Base Group (AFDW)
Bolling Air Force Base, D.C. 20332-5000

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT # I

29 July 1992

Dear Mr. Dillman:

During its meeting of 23 July 1992, the Commission reviewed and approved proposed exterior lighting changes to four of the Smithsonian Institution buildings on the Mall: the Castle, the Arts and Industries Building, the Air and Space Museum and the American History Museum. The members appreciated the chance to study the project via the extensive material sent the week previous to the meeting and are impressed by the level of detail indicated. The Commission is especially pleased by the predominant use of filtered (Pink Rosa) metal halide as a light source and acknowledge the need for incandescent at those buildings where metal halide would adversely alter the color of the brick (the Castle and Arts and Industries Building). While the changes submitted will be confined primarily to the respective museum grounds and buildings (and otherwise follow the guidelines recommended in the Interagency Draft Streetscape Manual), it is hoped that the installation will include provision for lighting level adjustment and flexibility.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Robert Dillman, Director
Office of Design & Construction
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C. 20560

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

30 July 1992

EXHIBIT J

Dear Mr. Kelly:

During its meeting 23 July 1992, the Commission met with David Ball, project coordinator for the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, and Tom Green and John Shank, of Benjamin Thompson & Associates, Inc., to review the concept for an addition to the west end of the concourse at Union Station. There has been a significant improvement in the project design since our last review, in particular the selection of glass as the dominant material, the proposed landscaping adjacent to the garage ramp, and the greenhouse configuration of the roof. Maintaining the transparency of the existing glass wall through the new enclosure is vital to the character of the concourse.

A site inspection reinforced the members' objection to an extension of commercial space into the pedestrian circulation pattern which is integral to Metro, the trains and the shops. Further studies are in order to maintain the integrity of the end wall as seen from the interior. One way to achieve this is to pull back the proposed storefront to the interior face of the masonry piers flanking the glazed wall.

We look forward to the development of the project. As always, the staff is available to help you.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Keith Kelly
Union Station Redevelopment Corporation
444 North Capitol Street, N.E.
Suite 740
Washington, D.C. 20001

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

29 July 1992

EXHIBIT # K

Dear Mr. Stanton:

During its meeting of 23 July 1992, the Commission considered a study proposed by the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation for a minor change to the FDR Memorial in front of the Archives Building.

As you may know, there has been some concern that pedestrians walking along the site could not readily identify the memorial since the stone block was set back a considerable distance from the sidewalk and there was no way to approach it without going across the grass. Initial studies involved a new walkway, but after a thorough evaluation of several alternatives, the decision was made to leave the existing conditions as they are, and simply confine the changes to moving the plaque closer to the sidewalk, elevating it on a low granite plinth to match the curb and tilting the face at an angle to make it more readable to passersby.

This seems like a good idea, and the Commission recommends you consider it favorably.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Robert G. Stanton, Regional Director
National Park Service, National Capital Region
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT L

29 July 1992

Dear Mr. Faught:

On July 23 1992, the Commission reviewed renovation and addition plans for Building 19 at the Naval Observatory. The project involves adaptive reuse of a historic out-building as a security facility for the Vice President's residential complex. Modest background architecture reflecting the character of the existing building has been wisely proposed for this unique location. It is this special context within which the Commission has reviewed the project and offers its approval and comments.

As the design is refined, the same attention should be given uniformly to all sides of the building, with subtle detailing providing adequate demarcation between the old and new portions of the building. Having shutters on only the front is troubling; you should either eliminate them altogether or have them on all sides. A final note on the front elevation: a symmetrical arrangement for the entrance is preferable to the current scheme. Perhaps an adjustment in plan can be made to allow such a change. Right now the facade is a little off balance.

We recognize that the project is proceeding with some urgency, so we are happy to work with you between meetings during the summer months if necessary.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. W.D. Faught
Director, Installations Planning Division
Department Of The Navy
Chesapeake Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Building 212, Washington Navy Yard
Washington, D.C. 20374-2121